EXHIBIT C

Case 1:14-cv-10434-RWZ Document 15 Filed 04/17/14 Page 1 of 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE: NEW ENGLAND COMPUNDING PHARMACY, INC. PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION) MDL NO.: 2419)
This document relates to the case identified below)))
NORMA KING,	- /)
Plaintiff,	No.: 1:14-CV-10434-RWZ
v.	
NEW ENGLAND COMPOUNDING)
PHARMACY,)
INC. A/K/A AND/OR D/B/A NEW)
ENGLAND COMPOUNDING CENTER,)
AMERIDOSE, LLC., ALAUNUS PHARMACEUTICAL, LLC,)
HAHNEMANN UNIVERSITY)
HOSPITAL, TENET HEALTHSYSTEM	,
HAHNEMANN, LLC, and PAIN CARE	Ś
PROFESSIONALS - PAIN CENTER AT	j
HAHNEMANN.)·
D - f 1 (-	·)
Defendants.	

PLIANTIFF'S COUNSEL'S REPLY TO DEFENADNTS' RESPONSE TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL

Plaintiff's counsel, Tucker Law Group, LLC, herby replies to Defendants, Tenet HealthSystem Hahnemann, LLC, Hahnemann University Hospital and Pain Care Professionals- Pain Center at Hahnemann's, Response in opposition to Plaintiff's Counsel's Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiff (Doc. No. 14).

A careful reading of Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw as Counsel ("Motion to Withdraw") (Doc. No. 11) makes clear that Defendants do not oppose Plaintiff's Counsel's request to withdraw. However, they do oppose Plaintiff's Counsel's request that the individual matter of <u>King v. NECC</u>, et al., 1:14-CV-10434-

Case 1:14-cv-10434-RWZ Document 15 Filed 04/17/14 Page 2 of 4

RWZ, be stayed for ninety (90) days to allow Plaintiff to consider either retaining new counsel or voluntarily dismissing this matter.

Defendants' only argument against the imposition of a stay is that they (and this Court) will be "ill served" and suffer prejudice. (Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Counsel's Motion to Withdraw (Doc. No. 14) ("Def. Resp."), at p. 4.) Specifically, Defendants state that a stay would cause "delay and disruption" to the multidistrict litigation, "drive up [discovery] costs" and cause duplicative discovery. (Id.) However, an examination of the facts and the procedural posture of this case make clear that no such problems would occur. First, discovery has not yet begun and it is unclear when it will. To that end, and based upon the last conference held by this Court and recent pleadings, it is highly unlikely that discovery will begin in the next ninety (90) days. It is clear that Defendants' understanding of the current procedural posture of this MDL is not a clear representation of where this litigation currently stands. (Def. Resp., at p. 4, "staying the Defendants' case while hundreds of others proceed with discovery . . . " (emphasis added).) Defendants have not engaged, and have made no attempts to engage, in any discovery in this matter thus far. Upon information and belief, they have not participated in the efforts of defendants' steering committee or this Court's conferences.

Given the procedural status of the case, it is inconceivable that Defendants (or this Court) would be prejudiced simply by allowing the Plaintiff ninety (90) days to either retain new counsel, proceed *pro se* or voluntarily withdraw the case. Notably, if Plaintiff decides to withdraw the case, Defendants would be placed in a better position. Defendants simply do not want to wait the time needed for Plaintiff to make a reasoned

Case 1:13-md-02419-RWZ Document 1101-3 Filed 04/30/14 Page 4 of 5

Case 1:14-cv-10434-RWZ Document 15 Filed 04/17/14 Page 3 of 4

and informed decision. However, Defendants fail to appreciate that this matter is very

important to Plaintiff and such time is in the interests of justice.

Defendants also misstate Massachusetts Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(d).

Defendants state that this Rule stands for the proposition that Plaintiff's Counsel must

allow time for Plaintiff to retain new counsel before he can seek to withdraw. However,

this reading is belied by the plain language of the Rule, which states: "Upon termination

of representation, a lawyer shall . . . allow[] time for employment of other counsel."

Rule 1.16(d). If this Court permits Plaintiff's Counsel to withdraw, along with a stay of

proceedings, Rule 1.16(d) will be complied with.

As stated more fully in the Motion to Withdraw, Plaintiff's counsel has been

placed in an untenable position and cannot proceed with this matter in good faith. As

such, the Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct dictate that Plaintiff's Counsel

be permitted to withdraw. Rule 1.16(a), (b).

In summary, Defendants have failed to articulate a good reason, or demonstrate

and prejudice, that would warrant a denial of Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw in any

respect.

TUCKER LAW GROUP, LLC

Date: April 17, 2014

By: /s/Kathleen Kirkpatrick

Bernard W. Smalley, Esquire Kathleen Kirkpatrick, Esquire One Penn Center at Suburban Station

1617 JFK Blvd., Suite 1700

Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 875-0609

(213) 073-0009

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case 1:14-cv-10434-RWZ Document 15 Filed 04/17/14 Page 4 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this motion was served upon all counsel of record via this Court's CM/ECF system. Additionally, this motion was served upon Plaintiff via electronic and/or regular mail at:

Norma King 49 N. 54th Street Philadelphia PA 19139 norma.king1950@msn.com

/s/Kathleen Kirkpatrick
Kathleen Kirkpatrick

Date: April 17, 2014